



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,634	02/26/2007	Toshiya Okahisa	1091-0002WOUS	3850
49698 7590 10/27/2010 MICHAUD-Kinney Group LLP 306 INDUSTRIAL PARK ROAD SUITE 206 MIDDLETOWN, CT 06457				
EXAMINER DESAL KAUSHIKKUMAR A				
ART UNIT 3788		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 10/27/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/581,634

Applicant(s)

OKAHISA, TOSHIYA

Examiner

KAUSHIKKUMAR DESAI

Art Unit

3788

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/15/10/7/21/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/10/2010 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 07/21/10 and 09/15/10 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because as required by CFR 1.98 (a) (3) (i) and (ii) it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in § 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent, publication, or other information listed that is not in the English language. The concise explanation may be either separate from applicant's specification or incorporated therein. (ii) A copy of the translation if a written English-language translation of a non-English-language document, or portion thereof, is within the possession, custody, or control of, or is readily available to any individual designated in § 1.56(c). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any

missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5492219 to Stupar.

As to claim 1, Stupar discloses a multi-chamber container [20', fig 5] that accommodates a plurality of agents [24, 22], comprising: an outer container body [34' defined by 26' and 28', fig 5] with an inner container body disposed therein, a plurality of filling chambers [32' and 98] to fill agents; that a communication portion [82'] that is provided in at least one of the filling chambers to cause the filling chambers to be communicated with one another; and an opening preventing portion [90'] that closes the communication portion in a carrying mode of the multi-chamber container [column 7-8:65-67 – 1-2], wherein the filling chambers are opened in there between via the communication portion by user's operation in the carrying mode of the multi-chamber container to a use mode of the multi-chamber container [column 11:20-54], the multi-chamber container is capable of folded in two for carrying mode, and wherein the opening preventing portion is a seal [90'] which bonds between the filling chambers [32' and 34'] in the carrying mode of the multi-chamber container, and peels off by

expanding [when one chamber of the container is squeezed it will expand the sealed area between the two chambers of the closed container, column 11:20-54] the folded multi-chamber container to open the filling chambers in therebetween via the communication port [82] in a use mode of the multi-chamber container.

It is noted that the claims are directed to apparatus which must be distinguished from the prior art in term of structure rather than function. Hence, the functional limitations "to open the filling chambers in therebetween via the communication port in a use mode of the multi-chamber container" which are narrative in form have been given little patentable weight. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be supported by the recitation in the claim of a sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). MPEP 2114. Furthermore, Product-by-Process recitations that, "peels off by expanding" have been given little patentable weight. In accordance to MPEP 2113, the method of forming or opening the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Please note that even though product-by-Process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product, i.e. multi-chamber container with seal in therebetween, does not depend on its method of opening, i.e. peels off by expanding. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Federal Circuit 1985). MPEP 2113.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stupar as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US PG PUB 2004/0188281 to Iwasa et al..

As to claim 11, Stupar discloses the claimed invention except a caution member to check opening between the filling chambers. Iwasa teaches a caution member [352, fig 12]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Stupar's multi-chamber container with caution member as taught by Iwasa to caution about / provide important information to the customer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine one known element in this case Stupar's multi-chamber container, with another, in this case Iwasa's caution member, to obtain the predictable results of cautioning about / provide important information to the customer. *KSR Int 'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1731, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. MPEP 2143 (A).

As to claim 12, Stupar modified in view of Iwasa discloses the caution member is attached to near the communication portion [3, fig 12], so that the caution member drops by expanding [when one chamber of the container is squeezed it will expand the sealed area between the two chambers of the closed container, column 11:20-54] the

folded multi-chamber container in the use mode of the multi-chamber container. It is noted that the claims are directed to apparatus which must be distinguished from the prior art in term of structure rather than function. Hence, the functional limitations "so that the caution member drops by expanding the folded multi-chamber container in the use mode of the multi-chamber container" which are narrative in form have been given little patentable weight. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be supported by the recitation in the claim of a sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). MPEP 2114. Furthermore, Product-by-Process recitations that, "drops by expanding" have been given little patentable weight. In accordance to MPEP 2113, the method of forming or opening the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Please note that even though product-by-Process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product, i.e. multi-chamber container with seal in therebetween, does not depend on its method of using, i.e. drops by expanding. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (*Federal Circuit* 1985). MPEP 2113.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1, 11 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The arguments have been addressed in the body of the rejections, at the appropriate locations.

Conclusion

8. **Prior Art not relied upon:** See attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAUSHIKKUMAR DESAI whose telephone number is (571)270-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571-272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/581,634
Art Unit: 3788

Page 8

/K. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 3728
Friday, October 22, 2010.

/Ehud Gartenberg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3788